

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested. Claims 1-3 and 5-17 remain pending in the application. By the foregoing amendment, claim 4 has been canceled, and claim 16 has been rewritten into independent form. Claims 1 and 10 have been amended to include a feature similar to that of claim 4. Independent claims 1, 10 and 16 are allowable.

Applicant notes that the Final Office Action dated June 5, 2004 has been withdrawn following submission of the Appeal Brief on February 15, 2005. However, in the most recent Office Action dated December 13, 2005, claims 1-15 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by newly cited U.S. Patent No. 5,714,972 (Tanaka). On pages 4-5 of the Office Action, claims 16 and 17 are rejected as being unpatentable over the Tanaka patent in combination with U.S. Patent No. 6,501,464 (Cobbley et al.) (claim 16) or U.S. Patent No. 6,359,615 (Singh) (claim 17). These rejections are respectfully traversed, as the documents relied upon by the Examiner, considered either individually or in the various combinations set forth in the Office Action, fail to teach or suggest Applicant's invention as set forth in independent claims 1, 10 and 16. For example, independent claim 1 is directed to a movable display which includes, among other features, means for detecting movement of the movable display relative to a first surface, and means for correlating movement of the movable display to information representing a portion of a first image stored in a database, wherein the detecting means is configured to detect orientation of the movable display.

In contrast, the Tanaka patent is directed to a display apparatus and display method, which as illustrated in Figure 13, includes a display screen 4. As described

at column 3, lines 53-55 of the Tanaka patent, a position detector included within the disclosed device is provided for detecting position in horizontal and vertical directions. However, the Tanaka patent does not teach or suggest detecting orientation of a movable display.

Such a feature, as set forth in Applicant's independent claims 1 and 10, provides significant advantages, such as an ability to reorient a movable display to best present information from the database. For example, Applicant's specification paragraph [0019] on pages 5-6 describes tracking enough positional coordinates so that changes in orientation of the display can be determined. Such a feature can be used to ensure that portions of an image will be oriented on a movable display in a manner as desired by a user. When, for example, a user reorients a rectangular display to provide a larger viewing area along a given direction (e.g., where an image is tall and thin, and best viewed by rotating the display 90°), the image will appear properly oriented within the display. Because such a feature is neither taught nor suggested by the Tanaka patent, either considered alone or in combination with the other documents mentioned by the Examiner, independent claims 1 and 10 are allowable.

With regard to independent claim 16, a movable display is disclosed which includes, among other features, a first image which is an image of a keyboard that can be operated using the movable display. Such a feature is, for example, disclosed in specification paragraph [0022], and is simply not taught or suggested by the Tanaka patent, when considered alone or in combination with the other documents mentioned by the Examiner.

Moreover, there would have been no motivation or suggestion to have combined features of the Tanaka patent with features of the Cobbley patent relied upon in the rejection of claim 16 to arrive at Applicant's claim 16 combination. For example, the Cobbley patent is directed to a graphical user interface in the form of a transparent keyboard overlaid on an information display. However, this patent is not directed to displaying information related to a physical document, in which information representing a portion of a first image is presented on a movable display. As such, there would have been no motivation or suggestion to have combined features of the Cobbley patent with those of the Tanaka patent. Claim 16 is therefore allowable.

In light of the foregoing, independent claims 1, 10 and 16 are allowable. All of the remaining claims depend from these claims and recite additional advantageous features which distinguish over the documents relied upon by the Examiner.

As such, the present application is in condition for allowance and a Notice of Allowance is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL PC

Date: March 13, 2006

By: _____



Patrick C. Keane
Registration No. 32,858

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404
(703) 836-6620